

## THE NEW TREATY.

The Committee on Foreign Relations Reports It Favorably.

The Senate in Executive Session Upon It.

Each Article to Be Acted Upon Separately.

Growing Opposition to Its Provisions Among Senators.

Earl Russell Grows at It in the House of Lords.

New Brunswick and the Dominion Dissatisfied.

WASHINGTON, May 15, 1871.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE SESSION. The proceedings in executive session to-day require only brief mention. The treaty was favorably reported by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Cameron, without any recommendation of amendment. That gentleman, after making a few remarks, was followed by Senator Morton, who explained certain parts of the treaty in response to inquiries.

Some general remarks were made upon it by Senators Sumner, Conkling, Carpenter, Casserly, Trumbull and others. Some of the Senators gave notice that they would offer some amendments to-morrow.

THE PLAN OF CONSIDERING THE TREATY. It was discussed, and it was decided that each article should be taken up separately and acted upon. The Senate refused to take up the resolution heretofore offered.

PROVIDING FOR THE REPORTING. In confidence of the debate on the Treaty of Washington by the official reporter of the Senate, said report to be subject to future disposition by that body. One of the objections against the resolution was that debate would be thereby prolonged, as Senators might desire in some future time to see their speeches in print. Besides, it was thought best to complete the action on the treaty as soon as practicable.

ANOTHER REPORTED SENATORIAL LEAK. Much surprise was manifested this afternoon in the vicinity of the Senate consequent on the report that the statement of the Joint High Commission had, like the Treaty, prematurely found its way into the newspapers. By some gentlemen this was considered unfortunate, believing it would not strengthen the treaty, while others, who claimed a knowledge of the document, expressed a contrary opinion. Several of the Senators were informed of the reported publication and were not slow in expressing their disapproval of the alleged occurrence, though they said, "the more to be regretted as the subject involved the question of confidential peace between the two countries and violated the confidence which usually attached to the consideration of matters of great importance. So far, however, there is no evidence of such a breach in the quarter which report designated."

THE OPPOSITION TO THE TREATY OF WASHINGTON is said to be gaining strength among Senators the more it is subject to examination. It is stated that it is in reality, that is, in the opinion of the Senators, not so good an arrangement for the citizens of the United States as the Johnson-Clarendon treaty. The latter provided in its first article that all claims against each government should be settled by the date of the ratification of the treaty, and that the date of the ratification of the convention of that year—should be submitted to a joint commission of four, with an umpire in each case of difference, and in article four it provided for the adjudication of the Alabama claims. In the Treaty of Washington all claims prior to 1861 are excluded, thus cutting off a really large aggregate of claims against England than the total of the Alabama claims, even should the latter all be allowed. It was understood that the Joint High Commission were to take cognizance of all claims between the two governments. When the commission was first agreed to, Sir Edward Thornton expressed his opinion that all claims would be considered.

THE PROTOCOL. However, relates that when the American Commissioners contended for the recognition of all claims, so as to make the treaty at least as thorough in its scope as the Johnson-Clarendon Convention, they were met on the part of the English Commissioners by the declaration that the preliminary correspondence between Mr. Fish and Sir Edward Thornton limited the inquiry to the period of the civil war, and the English side persisted in this view, as, indeed, it would appear in all their other views till the American side submitted the declaration by Earl Russell on Friday night in the House of Lords that the British government would give every attention to all matters which would aid it in resistance to the payment of these Alabama claims. It has created a marked impression upon many Senators, who now declare that the treaty must be subject to the most careful and critical examination and full understanding of its various provisions. This has also called attention to the language of

THE THREE NEW RULES OF INTERNATIONAL LAW which are to govern the Tribunal of Arbitrators, and it is alleged that these rules are so worded as to enable England really to escape from all responsibility for the Alabama claims and thus accomplish the successful resistance to their payment which Earl Russell predicted. The first rule is that a neutral government is bound to use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming or equipping of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or to carry on war against a Power with which it is at peace, and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been specially adapted in whole or in part within such jurisdiction to warfare use. The whole correspondence between the United States and Great Britain, occupying some four thousand printed pages, is filled with the assertion on the part of England, iterated and reiterated over and over again, that due diligence was observed in preventing the fitting out and arming of the Alabama, and that no vessel was fitted out or armed in part in British waters, as a vessel specially adapted for war, and consequently this first rule is so worded as to acquit the British government from liability or responsibility in the matter of the Alabama. The question so prominently put by Mr. Sumner as to the responsibility of England for subsequently recognizing the Alabama, after she received her guns and armament aboard, as a regular confederate man-of-war, is not touched upon at all in the treaty. Consequently it is held that if the United States fail to show that the Alabama was "specially adapted" as a man-of-war, when she left the Morsey, the American side of the case is lost. The United States so far have never been able to get England to admit that the Alabama was in this condition when she escaped into the English Channel, and Earl Russell's declaration last week is regarded by many Senators as an evident proof that England is as little prepared to make the acknowledgment under the Treaty of Washington as she was before the advent of the High Commission. The second rule declares that the neutral shall not "permit or suffer either to be used as the base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms, or the recruitment of men" and is considered by some as un-

necessary unless placed there with mischievous intent. Unless there is a hidden meaning, it is looked upon as only another of the treaty's twenty-four hour rule. As far as the augmentation of military supplies or arms is concerned it might be the hidden meaning that in case the United States were at war, their national vessels could not be supplied with coal outside their territorial limits; but a provision of that character would necessarily be entirely disregarded by the United States in such an event, nor does it prevent a neutral selling arms or munitions of war to any party, the risk of delivering such arms resting with the purchaser. As to the prohibition of the "recruitment of men," that already is in the law and the practice with the United States, as England discovered during the Crimean war. The third rule is merely a reiteration of the promise to exercise due diligence in carrying out the other two rules.

THE OPPOSITION OF THE TREATY. Therefore, contend that the rules can have no retroactive practical application, but that while they will not compel the payment of the Alabama claims, and the claims growing out of the damages by the other Anglo-Confederate ships are considered still weaker under the light of the rules, they answer a twofold purpose now. One is to induce the acceptance of the treaty by these

GLITTERING GENERALITIES, and the other is to tie the hands of the United States effectively in the future. Wherever the matter is alluded to in the treaty care is taken, it is said, to use no expression which can be construed into an acknowledgment that Great Britain has failed to fulfill its duty or duties. If it had been intended by the adoption of the rules to meet the cases of the Alabama and other Anglo-Confederate vessels it would, it is held, have been clearly stated that such was their object; but, on the contrary, not only does Earl Russell refuse to accept such an interpretation, but declares that the government will

RESIST THE PAYMENT OF THESE CLAIMS in every way; but the ablest lawyers in the Senate believe that the rules are framed in such a manner and with such careful and delicate phrasing as will enable England to escape from her liability to the United States much more easily than if the rules were omitted altogether. Great opposition is gathering to the article of the treaty—the article providing for the payment of

THE CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS. Against the United States. It is alleged that the protocol qualifies the extent of these claims, but the treaty itself does not. Under the language of the treaty "all claims," of any and every character, are to come up for adjudication. All the money now in the Treasury of the United States for cotton seized, which was claimed by British subjects as their property, is assigned to the rebel government, and amounting to some seventeen million dollars, will have, it is alleged, to be given up, although it is known that the equivalent given by these British claimants for most of it was the means of enabling the Confederates to carry on war against the United States. As to the explanations in the protocol, if any such exist, which these British claims might appear to be subject to certain limitations, the idea is scouted that anything in the protocol can limit or affect in any way the language of the treaty itself. A protocol is a mere record of the discussions—no more and no less. Usually the protocol is made up after each sitting, and thus presents a sort of report of the proceedings. In the present case it is well known that the protocol was not made out at the time, but was drawn up after the treaty had been agreed upon by the two secretaries from their recollection of the proceedings. In ordinary laws the courts never think of taking the debates in Congress to control them in the construction of the law. That is construed from its language, and the evidence is made to get at the meaning of the law, not by referring to the discussions pending the enactment of the statute. A treaty being the highest law of the land is construed with even, if possible, greater exactitude, and it is therefore held to be an absurdity to talk of the protocol controlling the language of the Convention, especially when, as in the case of the present treaty in the matter of British claims, there are absolutely no obscure expressions or words of limitation which render the meaning at all difficult to reach. The articles regarding

THE FISHERIES are a revival of the articles of the old reciprocity treaty, with an additional provision looking to the payment of a sum of money. It is held by several Senators that the freedom of our fisheries and the freedom of our markets to the Canadian caught fish and the product of fish is even a greater equivalent than the Canadian should have received for the inshore fishery privilege without the extraordinary provision looking to paying them a large sum of money besides. The equivalent of free entry for Canadian caught fish into our markets will permit the Canadians to compete with American fishermen in the sale of the deep sea fish catch. Our fishermen have no market for their fish in Canada, so that for the liberty of catching deep sea fish within three miles of the Canadian coast, the treaty enables Canadian fishermen to compete directly with ours in our own markets for all kinds of deep sea fish, no matter where caught. As the Canadian fishermen labor under lighter taxation than the fishermen of the United States, having no war debt to pay and no tax to make up on the material used in their equipment, and with free sale, it is feared, if the treaty goes into effect the American fishermen, with their greater burden of taxation, will soon be driven from the market by the cheaper British fish. In addition to this, the United States have to pay them a large sum of money, the advantages will be still more on the side of the Canadians. The question of the free navigation of

THE ST. LAWRENCE AND ITS CANALS is made by the convention a matter of treaty stipulation, but Senators who have examined the subject declare that while this has always been practically the case, and that it is to the interest of Canada, it should be, as the Canadian government derives even more income from the American use of those canals than from the tolls collected on their own vessels, yet that the treaty of Washington provides now for great equivalents for this privilege, which was always held to be a before, without seeking any greater equivalent than the tolls collected from the American vessels. These equivalents consist of a stipulation pledging the United States to endeavor to get the freedom of the State canals for Canadian vessels, and in a provision as to vessels on the lakes, which will give to Canadian steamers almost a monopoly of the water carrying trade between Chicago and Lake Ontario, and, in effect, throw open the lake coasting trade to the Canadians wherever the transit is through the Welland Canal. Another equivalent is placing the transit trade under the stability of a treaty stipulation, a matter which the Canadians have for years been endeavoring to effect, and one of the leading objects of the Canadian Commission came here in 1867. As for the provision of the treaty by which England agrees to urge upon Canada and New Brunswick not to place export duties on lumber and timber cut on that portion of the American territory in the State of Maine watered by the river St. John and its tributaries and floated down that river to the sea, and when the same is shipped to the United States as a very poor equivalent for the transportation and lake coasting trade given to Canada by the thirteenth article of the convention. With regard to the reference to arbitration of

THE NORTHWESTERN BOUNDARY a good deal of opposition is felt. It is said that there is no doubt the western terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad will be on the Umpqua Bay. If the Rosario Straits are selected as the boundary between the two countries the outlet to the Pacific from Bellingham Bay will be through a narrow strait, skirting the British boundary for fifty or sixty miles before it enters the wide strait of Juan de Fuca, which separates Vancouver Island from Washington Territory, while the boundary by the Canal de Haro would place the British territory a longer and safer distance from the route of vessels running in connection with the Northern Pacific Railroad. They do not, therefore, see the wisdom of leaving the question to arbitration, especially as an adverse judgment may injuriously affect us in the future, while, unless for aggressive purposes, it can be no object for England

to insist upon the Rosario boundary. It is not now believed that the Senate is disposed to act hastily, but rather that Senators will be inclined to wait for the discussion in the British Parliament, where it is supposed the phrasing of the new rules and the subject of England's responsibility for the payment of the Alabama claims will be fully entered into. In view of

EARL GRANVILLE'S DECLARATION. A strong effort will be made not to place the treaty beyond the power of revision until it is understood and agreed what it really means. It will be observed that the objections above noted are in addition to Mr. Sumner's protest against the United States in any way recognizing claims of English subjects which grew out of the war, and which, he alleges, should be paid to England. If all it was England's official conduct which gave vitality to the war and the supplies furnished the rebels by her connivance which nurtured it; and there are also in addition to the feeling that England in the treaty neither apologizes nor offers to recognize her liability for her hasty, injurious and unfriendly recognition of the belligerency of the Confederates before that belligerency was a fact, but which recognition really created the fact, which had not existed before the Queen's proclamation was put forth. It is said

THE DEMOCRATS met to-night to talk over the subject, especially as to the principles of international law involved; and further, that instead of Reverdy Johnson being opposed to the treaty, as reported, he earnestly desires that it may be ratified by the Senate.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE LEAK. The Select Committee on Senatorial Privileges held a meeting to-night and examined five witnesses concerning the publication of the treaty in the New York Tribune. G. W. Adams, correspondent of the World, testified in effect that he had no knowledge of how the copy was obtained or from whom. Messrs. White and Ramsdell, of the Tribune, solemnly testified that they did not procure it either from a Senator or any officer or employee of the Senate. They, however, declined to answer the questions as to the name of the person from whom it was obtained, and whether they paid money for it. This refusal on their part will be reported to the Senate to-morrow for the action of that body.

THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSIONERS. The members of the Joint High Commission who are here, together with a few invited guests, left this city early this morning on a special train of elegant palace cars, consisting of three saloon cars, one dining and one smoking car, for the purpose of paying a visit to Harper's Ferry. Among the guests were Secretary Robeson, Attorney General Akerman, the attachés of the British Legation, and quite a large number of ladies. At the Relay House the private car of the President of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad was attached to the special train from Washington. The car contained President Garrett, several other officers of the railroad and a number of prominent private citizens from Baltimore. Refreshments in abundance were provided after arriving at Harper's Ferry. Jefferson Rock and all the other points of interest were visited. Earl Russell and Sir Stafford Northcote, accompanied by some of the ladies, were the only persons who ascended Maryland Heights, but after having gained the summit they were satisfied that the view fully repaid them for their trouble. The splendid scenery of that region was universally admired. The party returned here late to-night delighted with their visit.

THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT AND THE TREATY. Preparing for the Attack—Earl Russell's Motion in the House of Lords Against the Ratification of the Treaty.

LONDON, May 15, 1871. In the House of Commons to-night Viscount Enfield, Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, said the government was not prepared to state the exact terms of the Treaty of Washington, as a copy of the document had not yet been received.

Mr. Disraeli, therefore, postponed putting the question to the government in relation thereto, of which he had previously given notice.

Mr. Gladstone stated that the government was unable to anticipate the exact time of the arrival of the treaty, but that it should be instantly submitted to Parliament.

In the House of Lords Earl Russell gave notice of his intention to move an address to the Queen against sanctioning the ratification of the Alabama treaty, in case the arbitrators are bound by rules or conditions other than the law of nations and English municipal laws existing during the civil war in the United States, when the alleged depredations upon American commerce were committed.

THE TREATY IN THE NEW DOMINION. Discussion of Its Provisions Among the Government Organs—Disaffiliation With the Fishery Clause.

TORONTO, Ont., May 15, 1871. The government press here give a rather equivocal support to the Treaty of Washington, while the opposition papers, on the contrary, are very decided in their expression of disapproval, holding that to grant to citizens of the United States the right to fish in Canadian waters may make it unnecessary for the American government to adopt a policy of reciprocity. Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the journals that represent the French speaking population of Ontario are in favor of rejecting all parts of the Treaty affecting Canada. The Globe thinks that self-interest should direct the people of Canada in any consideration of the Treaty, while at the same time it recommends that a difference of opinion in the matter between Great Britain and the Dominion should be avoided.

Opposition to the Treaty in the New Brunswick Assembly. ST. JOHN, N. B., May 15, 1871. The House of Assembly is now debating the terms of the new Treaty, which is meeting great opposition.

LYNCHING IN NEBRASKA. Hanging of James at St. Helena—A Career of Crime—Three Murders Confessed—Attempted Suicide.

YANKTON, May 15, 1871. An eye witness says:—I learn the following additional particulars relative to the hanging of the murderer James at St. Helena, Nebraska, yesterday. The prisoner confessed to the murder of John Coffey at Fort Buford, but claimed that his comrade Swisher shot him. He denied the murder of Locke until about two o'clock, by which time the crowd had increased to about 200. A vote had been taken, and he was told that he would be hung. He then confessed to the murder of Locke, and on being taken to the porch said:—

FELLOW CITIZENS—I have come to make a free and open confession of the crime I have committed. I know that I will have to be hung, and I only ask to be hung like a man. I have received a good deal of abuse for a murderer committed the first time, but I have not been hurt. I killed this man Locke down here. I had a quarrel with him the day before, but that was not the reason I killed him. I had no quarrel with him. We were going through the timber together; I had some angry words with him. He said I was a coward, and I killed him immediately.

The prisoner's real name is John McEachie. He was thirty years old and was born in New York. He went to Kentucky where he served in the Union army and came to Dakota in the Twenty-second Infantry. He had a sister at Bowling Green, Ky., and to her he had written several letters. He confessed to killing a man in Kentucky before leaving, but said it was accidentally. On Saturday night, after being taken across the river from St. Helena to Okhewa, a doctor's strychnine was given him by a prisoner at Sioux City. The dose was too heavy and he recovered, though he was sick yesterday from the effects.

EUROPEAN MARKETS. LONDON MONEY MARKET.—LONDON, May 15.—5 P. M.—Consolidated stock at 104 for gold money and the account. American bonds, 104 1/2 for 1870, 104 1/2 for 1871, 104 1/2 for 1872, 104 1/2 for 1873, 104 1/2 for 1874, 104 1/2 for 1875, 104 1/2 for 1876, 104 1/2 for 1877, 104 1/2 for 1878, 104 1/2 for 1879, 104 1/2 for 1880, 104 1/2 for 1881, 104 1/2 for 1882, 104 1/2 for 1883, 104 1/2 for 1884, 104 1/2 for 1885, 104 1/2 for 1886, 104 1/2 for 1887, 104 1/2 for 1888, 104 1/2 for 1889, 104 1/2 for 1890, 104 1/2 for 1891, 104 1/2 for 1892, 104 1/2 for 1893, 104 1/2 for 1894, 104 1/2 for 1895, 104 1/2 for 1896, 104 1/2 for 1897, 104 1/2 for 1898, 104 1/2 for 1899, 104 1/2 for 1900, 104 1/2 for 1901, 104 1/2 for 1902, 104 1/2 for 1903, 104 1/2 for 1904, 104 1/2 for 1905, 104 1/2 for 1906, 104 1/2 for 1907, 104 1/2 for 1908, 104 1/2 for 1909, 104 1/2 for 1910, 104 1/2 for 1911, 104 1/2 for 1912, 104 1/2 for 1913, 104 1/2 for 1914, 104 1/2 for 1915, 104 1/2 for 1916, 104 1/2 for 1917, 104 1/2 for 1918, 104 1/2 for 1919, 104 1/2 for 1920, 104 1/2 for 1921, 104 1/2 for 1922, 104 1/2 for 1923, 104 1/2 for 1924, 104 1/2 for 1925, 104 1/2 for 1926, 104 1/2 for 1927, 104 1/2 for 1928, 104 1/2 for 1929, 104 1/2 for 1930, 104 1/2 for 1931, 104 1/2 for 1932, 104 1/2 for 1933, 104 1/2 for 1934, 104 1/2 for 1935, 104 1/2 for 1936, 104 1/2 for 1937, 104 1/2 for 1938, 104 1/2 for 1939, 104 1/2 for 1940, 104 1/2 for 1941, 104 1/2 for 1942, 104 1/2 for 1943, 104 1/2 for 1944, 104 1/2 for 1945, 104 1/2 for 1946, 104 1/2 for 1947, 104 1/2 for 1948, 104 1/2 for 1949, 104 1/2 for 1950, 104 1/2 for 1951, 104 1/2 for 1952, 104 1/2 for 1953, 104 1/2 for 1954, 104 1/2 for 1955, 104 1/2 for 1956, 104 1/2 for 1957, 104 1/2 for 1958, 104 1/2 for 1959, 104 1/2 for 1960, 104 1/2 for 1961, 104 1/2 for 1962, 104 1/2 for 1963, 104 1/2 for 1964, 104 1/2 for 1965, 104 1/2 for 1966, 104 1/2 for 1967, 104 1/2 for 1968, 104 1/2 for 1969, 104 1/2 for 1970, 104 1/2 for 1971, 104 1/2 for 1972, 104 1/2 for 1973, 104 1/2 for 1974, 104 1/2 for 1975, 104 1/2 for 1976, 104 1/2 for 1977, 104 1/2 for 1978, 104 1/2 for 1979, 104 1/2 for 1980, 104 1/2 for 1981, 104 1/2 for 1982, 104 1/2 for 1983, 104 1/2 for 1984, 104 1/2 for 1985, 104 1/2 for 1986, 104 1/2 for 1987, 104 1/2 for 1988, 104 1/2 for 1989, 104 1/2 for 1990, 104 1/2 for 1991, 104 1/2 for 1992, 104 1/2 for 1993, 104 1/2 for 1994, 104 1/2 for 1995, 104 1/2 for 1996, 104 1/2 for 1997, 104 1/2 for 1998, 104 1/2 for 1999, 104 1/2 for 2000, 104 1/2 for 2001, 104 1/2 for 2002, 104 1/2 for 2003, 104 1/2 for 2004, 104 1/2 for 2005, 104 1/2 for 2006, 104 1/2 for 2007, 104 1/2 for 2008, 104 1/2 for 2009, 104 1/2 for 2010, 104 1/2 for 2011, 104 1/2 for 2012, 104 1/2 for 2013, 104 1/2 for 2014, 104 1/2 for 2015, 104 1/2 for 2016, 104 1/2 for 2017, 104 1/2 for 2018, 104 1/2 for 2019, 104 1/2 for 2020, 104 1/2 for 2021, 104 1/2 for 2022, 104 1/2 for 2023, 104 1/2 for 2024, 104 1/2 for 2025, 104 1/2 for 2026, 104 1/2 for 2027, 104 1/2 for 2028, 104 1/2 for 2029, 104 1/2 for 2030, 104 1/2 for 2031, 104 1/2 for 2032, 104 1/2 for 2033, 104 1/2 for 2034, 104 1/2 for 2035, 104 1/2 for 2036, 104 1/2 for 2037, 104 1/2 for 2038, 104 1/2 for 2039, 104 1/2 for 2040, 104 1/2 for 2041, 104 1/2 for 2042, 104 1/2 for 2043, 104 1/2 for 2044, 104 1/2 for 2045, 104 1/2 for 2046, 104 1/2 for 2047, 104 1/2 for 2048, 104 1/2 for 2049, 104 1/2 for 2050, 104 1/2 for 2051, 104 1/2 for 2052, 104 1/2 for 2053, 104 1/2 for 2054, 104 1/2 for 2055, 104 1/2 for 2056, 104 1/2 for 2057, 104 1/2 for 2058, 104 1/2 for 2059, 104 1/2 for 2060, 104 1/2 for 2061, 104 1/2 for 2062, 104 1/2 for 2063, 104 1/2 for 2064, 104 1/2 for 2065, 104 1/2 for 2066, 104 1/2 for 2067, 104 1/2 for 2068, 104 1/2 for 2069, 104 1/2 for 2070, 104 1/2 for 2071, 104 1/2 for 2072, 104 1/2 for 2073, 104 1/2 for 2074, 104 1/2 for 2075, 104 1/2 for 2076, 104 1/2 for 2077, 104 1/2 for 2078, 104 1/2 for 2079, 104 1/2 for 2080, 104 1/2 for 2081, 104 1/2 for 2082, 104 1/2 for 2083, 104 1/2 for 2084, 104 1/2 for 2085, 104 1/2 for 2086, 104 1/2 for 2087, 104 1/2 for 2088, 104 1/2 for 2089, 104 1/2 for 2090, 104 1/2 for 2091, 104 1/2 for 2092, 104 1/2 for 2093, 104 1/2 for 2094, 104 1/2 for 2095, 104 1/2 for 2096, 104 1/2 for 2097, 104 1/2 for 2098, 104 1/2 for 2099, 104 1/2 for 2100, 104 1/2 for 2101, 104 1/2 for 2102, 104 1/2 for 2103, 104 1/2 for 2104, 104 1/2 for 2105, 104 1/2 for 2106, 104 1/2 for 2107, 104 1/2 for 2108, 104 1/2 for 2109, 104 1/2 for 2110, 104 1/2 for 2111, 104 1/2 for 2112, 104 1/2 for 2113, 104 1/2 for 2114, 104 1/2 for 2115, 104 1/2 for 2116, 104 1/2 for 2117, 104 1/2 for 2118, 104 1/2 for 2119, 104 1/2 for 2120, 104 1/2 for 2121, 104 1/2 for 2122, 104 1/2 for 2123, 104 1/2 for 2124, 104 1/2 for 2125, 104 1/2 for 2126, 104 1/2 for 2127, 104 1/2 for 2128, 104 1/2 for 2129, 104 1/2 for 2130, 104 1/2 for 2131, 104 1/2 for 2132, 104 1/2 for 2133, 104 1/2 for 2134, 104 1/2 for 2135, 104 1/2 for 2136, 104 1/2 for 2137, 104 1/2 for 2138, 104 1/2 for 2139, 104 1/2 for 2140, 104 1/2 for 2141, 104 1/2 for 2142, 104 1/2 for 2143, 104 1/2 for 2144, 104 1/2 for 2145, 104 1/2 for 2146, 104 1/2 for 2147, 104 1/2 for 2148, 104 1/2 for 2149, 104 1/2 for 2150, 104 1/2 for 2151, 104 1/2 for 2152, 104 1/2 for 2153, 104 1/2 for 2154, 104 1/2 for 2155, 104 1/2 for 2156, 104 1/2 for 2157, 104 1/2 for 2158, 104 1/2 for 2159, 104 1/2 for 2160, 104 1/2 for 2161, 104 1/2 for 2162, 104 1/2 for 2163, 104 1/2 for 2164, 104 1/2 for 2165, 104 1/2 for 2166, 104 1/2 for 2167, 104 1/2 for 2168, 104 1/2 for 2169, 104 1/2 for 2170, 104 1/2 for 2171, 104 1/2 for 2172, 104 1/2 for 2173, 104 1/2 for 2174, 104 1/2 for 2175, 104 1/2 for 2176, 104 1/2 for 2177, 104 1/2 for 2178, 104 1/2 for 2179, 104 1/2 for 2180, 104 1/2 for 2181, 104 1/2 for 2182, 104 1/2 for 2183, 104 1/2 for 2184, 104 1/2 for 2185, 104 1/2 for 2186, 104 1/2 for 2187, 104 1/2 for 2188, 104 1/2 for 2189, 104 1/2 for 2190, 104 1/2 for 2191, 104 1/2 for 2192, 104 1/2 for 2193, 104 1/2 for 2194, 104 1/2 for 2195, 104 1/2 for 2196, 104 1/2 for 2197, 104 1/2 for 2198, 104 1/2 for 2199, 104 1/2 for 2200, 104 1/2 for 2201, 104 1/2 for 2202, 104 1/2 for 2203, 104 1/2 for 2204, 104 1/2 for 2205, 104 1/2 for 2206, 104 1/2 for 2207, 104 1/2 for 2208, 104 1/2 for 2209, 104 1/2 for 2210, 104 1/2 for 2211, 104 1/2 for 2212, 104 1/2 for 2213, 104 1/2 for 2214, 104 1/2 for 2215, 104 1/2 for 2216, 104 1/2 for 2217, 104 1/2 for 2218, 104 1/2 for 2219, 104 1/2 for 2220, 104 1/2 for 2221, 104 1/2 for 2222, 104 1/2 for 2223, 104 1/2 for 2224, 104 1/2 for 2225, 104 1/2 for 2226, 104 1/2 for 2227, 104 1/2 for 2228, 104 1/2 for 2229, 104 1/2 for 2230, 104 1/2 for 2231, 104 1/2 for 2232, 104 1/2 for 2233, 104 1/2 for 2234, 104 1/2 for 2235, 104 1/2 for 2236, 104 1/2 for 2237, 104 1/2 for 2238, 104 1/2 for 2239, 104 1/2 for 2240, 104 1/2 for 2241, 104 1/2 for 2242, 104 1/2 for 2243, 104 1/2 for 2244, 104 1/2 for 2245, 104 1/2 for 2246, 104 1/2 for 2247, 104 1/2 for 2248, 104 1/2 for 2249, 104 1/2 for 2250, 104 1/2 for 2251, 104 1/2 for 2252, 104 1/2 for 2253, 104 1/2 for 2254, 104 1/2 for 2255, 104 1/2 for 2256, 104 1/2 for 2257, 104 1/2 for 2258, 104 1/2 for 2259, 104 1/2 for 2260, 104 1/2 for 2261, 104 1/2 for 2262, 104 1/2 for 2263, 104 1/2 for 2264, 104 1/2 for 2265, 104 1/2 for 2266, 104 1/2 for 2267, 104 1/2 for 2268, 104 1/2 for 2269, 104 1/2 for 2270, 104 1/2 for 2271, 104 1/2 for 2272, 104 1/2 for 2273, 104 1/2 for 2274, 104 1/2 for 2275, 104 1/2 for 2276, 104 1/2 for 2277, 104 1/2 for 2278, 104 1/2 for 2279, 104 1/2 for 2280, 104 1/2 for 2281, 104 1/2 for 2282, 104 1/2 for 2